REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The specification is amended to recognize the trademark JAVA and MICROSOFT.

Claims 1-6 are pending.

Claims 1 and 4 are amended to replace references to "those" with the phrase "from the object library." Claim 1 is also amended to remove the reference to "compression module." These amendments overcome the 35 USC § 112 objections to claims 1 and 4.

It is noted that an antecedent basis for the phrase "the compression module" is present in claim 4 (see line 11, reciting "a compression module…")

Claim 1 is also amended to replace "pack" with "packing."

Claims 2, 3, 5 and 6 are canceled without prejudice to pursue these claims in other applications. Cancellation renders moot the 35 USC § 112 objections to these claims.

The rejection of claims 1 and 4 as anticipated by published patent application No. 2003/0009743 of Fresko et al. ("Fresko") is respectfully traversed. "To anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim." MPEP § 2131. In the present case, Fresko fails to achieve this standard.

The present invention is directed to an embedded system program code reduction method and system. As recited in amended claims 1 and 4, the method, and the system as well, first compiles the source code of each application program into bytecode, then picks from the object library essential objects that are required for use by the application programs during runtime and compresses the picked essential objects, and lastly integrates each bytecode-based application program with the compressed essential objects into a set of embedded system program code which is to be burned into the embedded system.

Fresko discloses a method and apparatus for preprocessing and packaging JAVA class files. The method removes duplicate information elements from a set of class files to reduce the size of individual class files. In practice, Fresko teaches, first, examining whether the constant pool table 305 of the class files matches another constant pool table of other class files, then removing the constant pool table 305 of the class files if the constant pool table 305 of the class files matches the another constant table of the other class files, compressing the class files without the removed constant pool table 305, and generating a shared constant pool table, and lastly integrating the shared constant pool table with the class files without the removed constant pool table 305.

The Office Action alleges that Fresko discloses in FIG. 4 and paragraphs [0062] and [0063] of the specification the technical feature of "picking essential objects that are required for use by the application programs during runtime," as recited in amended claims 1 and 4. However, Fresko discloses in FIG. 4 and paragraphs [0062] and [0063] the technical feature of "examining whether the constant pool table 305 of the class files matches another constant pool table of other class files" and "removing the constant pool table 305" only, but fails to teach or suggest the technical feature of "picking essential objects that are required for use by the application programs during runtime."

Further, the Office Action alleges that Fresko discloses in FIG. 4 and paragraph [0065] the technical feature of "compressing the picked essential objects," as recited in amended claims 1 and 4. However, Fresko discloses in FIG. 4 and paragraph [0065] the technical feature of "compressing the class files with the constant pool table 305 removed" only, but fails to teach or suggest the technical feature of "compressing the picked essential objects."

The Office Action further alleges that Fresko discloses in FIGS. 4 and 5 and paragraphs [0065] and [0068] of the specification the technical feature of "integrating each bytecode-based application program with the compressed essential objects into a set of embedded system program code," as recited in amended claims 1 and 4. However, Fresko discloses in FIGS. 4 and 5 and paragraphs [0065] and [0068] the technical feature of "integrating the shared constant pool table with the class files with the constant pool table 305 removed" only, but fails to teach or suggest the technical feature of "integrating each bytecode-based application program with the compressed essential objects into a set of embedded system program code."

Because Fresko fails to teach or suggest all elements of the claims, claims 1 and 4 are not anticipated by this reference.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

No fee is believed due. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized during prosecution of this application and any related appeal, to charge any fees that may be required (except for patent issue fees required under 37 CFR §1.18) or to credit any overpayment of fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0337. If an extension of time is required in connection with this paper, please consider this a Petition therefor and charge any fees required to Deposit Account No. 50-0337.

Dated: January 27, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

Miles Yamanaka
Reg. No. 45,665

FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P
555 South Flower Street , 41st Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071
(213) 892-9200 – Telephone
(213) 892-9494 – Facsimile